



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/848,426	05/04/2001	Juhnyoung Lee	YOR9-2001-0251US1	7808
7590	09/13/2004		EXAMINER	
McGuireWoods, LLP Suite 1800 1750 Tysons Boulevard Tysons Corner McLean, VA 22102-3915			HOLMES, MICHAEL B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2121	
DATE MAILED: 09/13/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/848,426	LEE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael B. Holmes	2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 – www.uspto.gov

Examiner's Detailed Office Action

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is responsive to communication received on June 14, 2004.

Amendment "A" under 37 CFR § 1.111. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application 09/848,426 filed is respectfully requested by applicant. All such supporting documentation has been placed in applicant's file.

2. The Title 35 USC § 103 (a) rejection stands, the complete text has been included below.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18 have been examined.

Specification

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of minor informalities.

- "The system and method uses rules..." on L. 4 should read "The system and method use rules..."

➤ “The system and method includes a data...” on L. 6 should read “The system and method include a data ...”

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1-2, 4, 9-10, 16, and 18 are objected to because of the following informalities:

➤ Claim 1 recites “RFQs” on L. 9, which is an abbreviation for “Request for Quotes”. The Examiner suggests that the Applicant recite “Request for Quotes” as this is the first mention in the claims.

➤ Claim 2 recites “...the enterprise data sources include one or more of...” on L. 1, which is vague and recites to an open-ended group. The Examiner suggests that the Applicant recite “...the enterprise data sources include one or more data sources selected from the group consisting of...”

➤ Claim 4 recites “...about one or more of objects including...” on L. 1-2, which is vague and recites to an open-ended group. The Examiner suggests that the Applicant recite “...about one or more of objects selected from the group consisting of...”

➤ Claim 5 recites the set of actions” on L. 3, which has no antecedent basis.

➤ Claim 9 recites “...the attribute categories include...” on L. 1, which is vague and recites to an open-ended group. The Examiner suggests that the Applicant recite

"...the attribute categories include attributes selected from the group consisting of...

- Claim 10 is objected to because it depends on rejected claim 1.
- Claim 16 is objected to because it depends on rejected claim 13.
- Claim 18 recites "A machine readable medium..." on L. 1, which may be non-statutory. The Examiner suggests that the Applicant recite "A computer readable medium..."
- Claim 18 is incomplete because Pg. 20 of the Application is missing. The Examiner substitutes Claim 18 with the version in the published version of this Application.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-6 and 11-15, and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khedkar (US Patent Publication Number 2002/0147695; Filed 6/21/1999) in view of Baronwoski (US Patent Number 5,926,800; Issued 7/20/1999).

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites

A computer system for ranking one or more objects having two or more attributes, comprising:

- (a) a data aggregator that integrates data from two or more enterprise data sources into an aggregated enterprise database;
- (b) a knowledge base generator that constructs a knowledge base by extracting at least one of facts and rules from the aggregated enterprise database and stores the facts and rules in a knowledge base database; and
- (c) a bid configurator that constructs one or more sell bid candidates for one or more target RFQs by using at least one inference engine and the extracted facts and rules from the knowledge base database.

➤ Regarding claim 1, Khedkar discloses (b) a knowledge base generator that uses a neural network to calculate a property value from a set of inputs that (c) constructs one or more property value estimates by using at least one inference engine and the extracted facts and rules from the knowledge base database (Khedkar Fig. 1-4; ¶7; ¶14-26; ¶32-33; ¶36). However, Khedkar does not teach providing a data aggregator that integrates data from two or more enterprise data sources. Baronowski teaches providing (a) a data aggregator that integrates data from two or more enterprise data sources (Baronowski Fig. 1; Col 5 L. 7-31, "The system... line of credit.") – in order to accommodate and account for different sources of data (Baronowski Col 3 L. 41-59, "These and other... the policyholder."). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Khedkar in view of Baronowski by providing a data aggregator that integrates data from two or more enterprise data sources.

Claim 2

- Regarding claim 2, see §103 rejection for claim 1, *supra*, and (Baronowoski Fig. 1; Col 5 L. 7-31, "The system... line of credit.") –in order to accommodate and account for different sources of data (Baronowoski Col 3 L. 41-59, "These and other... the policyholder.").

Claim 3

- Regarding claim 3, see §103 rejection for claim 1, *supra*, and (Khedkar Fig. 2; ¶14-19).

Claim 4

- Regarding claim 4, see §103 rejection for claim 1, *supra*, and (Baronowoski Fig. 1; Col 5 L. 7-31, "The system... line of credit.") –in order to accommodate and account for different sources of data (Baronowoski Col 3 L. 41-59, "These and other... the policyholder.").

Claim 5

- Regarding claim 5, see §103 rejection for claim 1, *supra*, and (Khedkar Fig. 2-4; ¶7; ¶14-26; ¶32-33; ¶36).

Claim 6

- Regarding claim 6, see §103 rejection for claim 3, *supra*, and (Khedkar Fig. 2; ¶14-19).

Claim 11

- Regarding claim 11, see §103 rejection for claim 1, *supra*, and (Khedkar ¶30-36).

Claim 12

➤ Regarding claim 12, see §103 rejection for claim 1, *supra*, and (Khedkar ¶33-35).

Claim 13

Claim 13 recites

A method of configuring one or more sell bids, comprising the steps of:

- (a) aggregating data from one or more enterprise data sources;
- (b) storing the aggregated enterprise data in an integrated database system;
- (c) extracting one or more facts useful for bid configuration from the integrated database system;
- (c)
- (d) deriving one or more rules useful for bid configuration from the integrated database system;
- (e) constructing one or more knowledge base systems by storing the facts and rules in a form understood by one or more inference engines; and
- (f) constructing one or more sell bid candidates for one or more target RFQs by running one or more facts and rules from the target RFQs and the knowledge base system to the one or more inference engines.

➤ Regarding claim 13, Khedkar discloses a method of configuring property value estimation, comprising the steps of (c) extracting useful facts, (d) deriving useful rules, (e) constructing knowledge base systems, and (f) constructing property value estimations (Khedkar Fig. 1-4; ¶7; ¶14-26; ¶32-33; ¶36). However,

Khedkar does not teach aggregating data from one or more enterprise data sources and storing the aggregated data. Baronowoski teaches (a) aggregating data from one or more enterprise data sources and (b) storing the aggregated data (Baronowoski Fig. 1; Col 5 L. 7-31, "The system... line of credit.") –in order to accommodate and account for different sources of data (Baronowoski Col 3 L. 41-59, "These and other... the policyholder."). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Khedkar in view of Baronowski

by aggregating data from one or more enterprise data sources and storing the aggregated data.

Claim 14

- Regarding claim 14, see §103 rejection for claim 13, *supra*, and (Khedkar ¶33-35).

Claim 15

- Regarding claim 15, see §103 rejection for claim 13, *supra*, and (Khedkar Fig. 2; ¶14-19).

Claim 17

- Regarding claim 17, see §103 rejection for claim 1, *supra*, and (Khedkar ¶30-36).

Claim 18

Claim 18 recites

A machine readable medium containing code for configuring one or more sell bids, the code implementing the steps of:

- (a) aggregating data from one or more enterprise data sources;
- (b) storing the aggregated enterprise data in an integrated database system;
- (c) extracting one or more facts useful for bid configuration from the integrated database system;
- (c)
- (d) deriving one or more rules useful for bid configuration from the integrated database system;
- (e) constructing one or more knowledge base systems by storing the facts and rules in a form understood by one or more inference engines; and
- (f) constructing one or more sell bid candidates for one or more target RFQs by running one or more facts and rules from the target RFQs and the knowledge base system to the one or more inference engines.

- Regarding claim 18, Khedkar discloses a computer-readable medium (Khedkar Fig. 4; ¶7) containing code for configuring property value estimation, comprising the steps of (c) extracting useful facts, (d) deriving useful rules, (e) constructing knowledge base systems, and (f) constructing property value estimations

(Khedkar Fig. 1-4; ¶7; ¶14-26; ¶32-33; ¶36). However, Khedkar does not teach aggregating data from one or more enterprise data sources and storing the aggregated data. Baronowski teaches (a) aggregating data from one or more enterprise data sources and (b) storing the aggregated data (Baronowski Fig. 1; Col 5 L. 7-31, "The system... line of credit.") –in order to accommodate and account for different sources of data (Baronowski Col 3 L. 41-59, "These and other... the policyholder."). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Khedkar in view of Baronowski by aggregating data from one or more enterprise data sources and storing the aggregated data.

6. Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khedkar (US Patent Publication Number 2002/0147695; Filed 6/21/1999) in view of Baronowski (US Patent Number 5,926,800; Issued 7/20/1999) and further in view of Background Description.

Claim 7

Claim 7 recites "The system of 1, wherein (d) the one or more sell bid candidates comprise one or more attribute name and value pairs, each of which belongs to one or more attribute categories."

➤ Regarding claim 7, Khedkar discloses (b) a knowledge base generator that uses a neural network to calculate a property value from a set of inputs that (c) constructs one or more property value estimates by using at least one inference engine and the extracted facts and rules from the knowledge base database (Khedkar Fig. 1-4; ¶7; ¶14-26; ¶32-33; ¶36). However, Khedkar does not teach

providing a data aggregator that integrates data from two or more enterprise data sources. Baronowoski teaches providing (a) a data aggregator that integrates data from two or more enterprise data sources (Baronowoski Fig. 1; Col 5 L. 7-31, "The system... line of credit.") –in order to accommodate and account for different sources of data (Baronowoski Col 3 L. 41-59, "These and other... the policyholder.").

However, Khedkar in view of Baronowoski does not teach that the one or more sell bid candidates comprise one or more attribute name and value pairs, each of which belongs to one or more attribute categories. Background Description of this Application teaches that (d) the one or more sell bid candidates comprise one or more attribute name and value pairs, each of which belongs to one or more attribute categories. (Background Description Pg. 2 L. 18-22) –in order to allow the sellers to match exactly the buyers' requirements (Background Description Pg. 2 L. 24-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Khedkar, in view of Baronowski, and further in view of Background Description, by having the one or more sell bid candidates comprise one or more attribute name and value pairs, each of which belongs to one or more attribute categories.

Claim 8

Claim 8 recites "The system of 1, wherein (d) the RFQs comprise one or more attribute name and value range pairs, each of which belongs to one or more attribute categories."

➤ Regarding claim 8, Khedkar discloses (b) a knowledge base generator that uses a neural network to calculate a property value from a set of inputs that (c) constructs one or more property value estimates by using at least one inference engine and the extracted facts and rules from the knowledge base database (Khedkar Fig. 1-4; ¶7; ¶14-26; ¶32-33; ¶36). However, Khedkar does not teach providing a data aggregator that integrates data from two or more enterprise data sources. Baronowoski teaches providing (a) a data aggregator that integrates data from two or more enterprise data sources (Baronowoski Fig. 1; Col 5 L. 7-31, "The system... line of credit.") –in order to accommodate and account for different sources of data (Baronowoski Col 3 L. 41-59, "These and other... the policyholder.").

However, Khedkar in view of Baronowoski does not teach that the RFQs comprise one or more attribute name and value range pairs, each of which belongs to one or more attribute categories. Background Description of this Application teaches that (d) the RFQs comprise one or more attribute name and value range pairs, each of which belongs to one or more attribute categories. (Background Description Pg. 2 L. 18-22) –in order to allow the sellers to match exactly the buyers' requirements (Background Description Pg. 2 L. 24-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Khedkar, in view of Baronowski, and further in view of Background Description, by having the RFQs comprise one or more attribute name and value range pairs, each of which belongs to one or more attribute categories.

Claim 9

- Regarding claim 9, see §103 rejection for claim 7, *supra*.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's remarks have been received and are noted. However, the issue whether an amendment narrows the scope of the claim is not addressed here and is reserved for the courts.

Examiners Summary

4. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated

from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Correspondence Information

5. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Michael B. Holmes** who may be reached via telephone at **(703) 308-6280**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. eastern standard time.

If you need to send the Examiner, a facsimile transmission regarding After Final issues, please send it to **(703) 746-7238**. If you need to send an Official facsimile transmission, please send it to **(703) 746-7239**. If you would like to send a Non-Official (draft) facsimile transmission the fax is **(703) 746-7240**. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the **Examiner's Supervisor, Anthony Knight**, may be reached at **(703) 308-3179**.

Any response to this office action should be mailed to:

Director of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231. Hand-delivered responses should be delivered to the Receptionist, located on the fourth floor of **Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive Arlington, Virginia**.



Anthony Knight
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600